```
1
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                         DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
 2
      KEN JOHANSEN, individually and
 3
      on behalf of all others
      similarly situated,
                                            Civil Action
 4
               Plaintiff,
                                            No. 1:15-cv-12920-ADB
      v.
 5
      LIBERTY MUTUAL GROUP, INC.; and
 6
      SPANISH QUOTES, INC. D/b/a
      WESPEAKINSURANCE,
 7
           Defendants,
      LIBERTY MUTUAL GROUP, INC.,
 8
           Crossclaimant,
      v.
 9
      SPANISH QUOTES, INC. D/b/a
10
      WESPEAKINSURANCE,
           Crossdefendant,
11
      LIBERTY MUTUAL GROUP, INC.,
      LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE
12
      COMPANY,
13
           Third-party plaintiffs,
14
      v.
15
      PRECISE LEADS, INC., and
      DIGITAS, INC.,
16
           Third-Party Defendants
      BEFORE: HONORABLE ALLISON D. BURROUGHS
17
18
                              STATUS CONFERENCE
19
                John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
                               Courtroom No. 10
20
                               1 Courthouse Way
                               Boston, MA 02210
21
                               November 5, 2024
22
                                 10:00 a.m.
23
                              Valerie A. O'Hara
                           Official Court Reporter
24
                John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
                              1 Courthouse Way
25
                               Boston, MA 02210
                          E-mail: vaohara@gmail.com
```

APPEARANCES: For the Third-Party Plaintiffs Liberty Mutual Insurance Company: Robins Kaplan LLP, by LAUREN J. COPPOLA, ATTORNEY, and MANLEEN SINGH, ATTORNEY, 800 Boylston Street, Suite 2500, Boston, MA 02199; For the Third-Party Defendant Digitas: Steptoe LLP, by MICHAEL DOCKTERMAN, ESQ., 227 West Monroe St., Suite 4700 Chicago, IL 60606; Henshon Klein LLP, by LAURA GREENBERG-CHAO, ATTORNEY, 37 Walnut Street, Suite 110, Wellesley, MA 02481.

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE CLERK: This is Civil Action 15-12920,
3	Johansen vs. Liberty Mutual Group, Inc. Will counsel
4	identify themselves for the record.
5	MS. COPPOLA: Good morning, your Honor, Lauren Coppola
6	on behalf of the Liberty Mutual parties.
7	MS. SINGH: Good morning, your Honor, Manleen Singh on
8	behalf of Liberty Mutual parties.
9	MR. DOCKTERMAN: Good morning, your Honor,
09:59АМ 10	Michael Dockterman on behalf of Digitas.
11	MS. GREENBERG-CHAO: Good morning, your Honor,
12	Laura Greenberg-Chao, local counsel for Digitas.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Well, just for starters, I only
14	reopened the case because it was remanded back. That was not
15	any sort of ruling on any sort of merit, that was just it comes
16	back, and I reopen it. So, and I know that there is some
17	opposition to the reopening, but that is a nonevent, it's just
18	a bureaucratic administrative thing.
19	So, that said, there wasn't much in response to the
10:00AM 20	merits of the thing, and I'm not really sure that I have the
21	authority to do anything on this, so who wants to go first?
22	MR. DOCKTERMAN: Your Honor, if you're asking, but,
23	please.
24	THE COURT: Ladies before gentlemen.
25	MS. COPPOLA: Thank you, your Honor, good morning. So

1.3

10:01AM 20

10:00AM 10

from what I understand, your Honor, the case has been administratively reopened, and it will stay that way. I think what's before the Court --

THE COURT: It's not going to stay that way forever.

MS. COPPOLA: Understood. Understood. You'd like to be finally done with this case. The way I see it, your Honor, is that as Liberty sees it, your Honor, is that this Court contemplated it as well as the First Circuit that the time would come where if the parties didn't agree on the fees and costs that Liberty was entitled to under the indemnification clause, which everyone is, all the parties -- all orders have now ruled Liberty is entitled to its indemnification under the contract.

So as this Court contemplated, Liberty could reopen the case and conduct a damages assessment hearing. If your Honor is inclined, if the Court is inclined to hear argument as to whether or not Liberty has waived the right to seek its damages, then I would ask the Court for a full briefing schedule on that, however, I think what this Court has already ruled in multiple orders is that the Liberty is entitled, it reminded the parties that ECF 224 that Liberty is entitled to indemnification of its attorney's fees incurred in defending against the Johansen lawsuit, so what Liberty would like to do, recommends this Court do is set a briefing schedule for it to present the evidence on its damages and conduct a hearing, if

1 this Court thinks it's necessary. THE COURT: Why didn't you already do that? 2 MS. COPPOLA: I'm sorry, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Why didn't you do that in the briefing 4 5 that we've had? MS. COPPOLA: In the briefing that we had in 6 connection with the summary judgment? 7 THE COURT: No, the briefing in connection with why 8 9 I'm sitting here. 10:02AM 10 MS. COPPOLA: So the briefing, your Honor, that we put 11 forward was as scheduled because we could not agree on a schedule with Digitas. And so, your Honor, we'll happily file 12 1.3 it in a week's time. It's a lot of materials over the course 14 of five years. 15 Liberty has been diligently putting together its 16 damages record to present to this Court, and we'll happily do so as soon as this Court orders it be due. 17 18 THE COURT: How much money are we talking about, 19 ballpark? 10:02AM 20 MS. COPPOLA: Millions, your Honor, about 2. And 21 we're putting together, your Honor, affidavits with legal fee 22 invoices properly redacted. 23 THE COURT: I'm not concerned about the amount, I'm concerned about the waiver argument -- I mean not waiver, the 24 time has past, Liberty didn't do anything. 25

10:04AM 20

10:03AM 10

MS. COPPOLA: Your Honor, the case was on appeal for all that time, and it is just -- the appeal order just came out, and I have the dates in front of me if you give me one moment.

THE COURT: I know the dates. It's not that, you missed the Rule 59 deadline, you missed the Rule 60 deadlines. I mean I've looked back over the materials this morning. We never said you could file all your papers for fees later, what we said was we may be in a position later, and that's like if the First Circuit sent it back, they remanded before they made a decision.

There's all sorts of way we could have had jurisdiction or authority to do that, and I'm not sure we did anymore.

MS. COPPOLA: What the Court -- this Court, your Honor, had said on that limited remand was it could have done -- it had a damages assessment hearing. If the First Circuit remanded back to this Court, or, in the alternative, wait until the First Circuit ruled on the liability issue, and then conduct a damages assessment here. This Court looked at both of those avenues.

The COURT: It didn't say that I would, it said I could, but there needs to be a procedural mechanism for that.

Just back it up. Why didn't Liberty file anything? Why didn't they preserve their rights on this?

1 MS. COPPOLA: So, your Honor, I'd submit that Liberty did in its motion for summary judgment. It requested the Court 2 provided the opportunity to present a fulsome of record with 3 affidavits. It's in its summary judgment motion that it filed 4 many years ago, your Honor, so it did preserve its right to do 6 that. It's ECF 195, which is its motion for summary judgment in which Liberty states, "It respectfully requests the Court 7 permitted to submit appropriate affidavits and evidence 8 regarding the legal fees, costs, and other damages incurred." 9 10:04AM 10 This Court has ordered, your Honor, that Digitas 11 breached its contractual indemnification. 12 THE COURT: Agreed. 13 MS. COPPOLA: Inherent in that, your Honor, is its 14 obligation to pay those fees. THE COURT: Correct. 15 16 MS. COPPOLA: If Digitas could agree, we come to an 17 agreement. We've had a mediation. It proved unsuccessful 18 while the appeal was pending. There is a judgment which 19 requires a monetary payment. What is in dispute right now is the amount of that payment, so this Court has already ordered 10:05AM 20 21 the payment of fees, your Honor. There have been no waiver of 22 any right --23 THE COURT: Okav. 24 MS. COPPOLA: Any right to obtain those fees, it's

25

already been ordered.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Where was it ordered? MS. COPPOLA: In your Honor's summary judgment order. 2 THE COURT: Okay. I will go back and take a look at 3 that. I did not look at that this morning. 4 5 MS. COPPOLA: And, your Honor, I would, again, I would 6 request that if this Court is entertaining a waiver argument that the Court allow a briefing to be a fulsome briefing to be 7 conducted on it. 8 9 THE COURT: I will let you do a fulsome briefing on the waiver argument. It doesn't need to include all the 10:06AM 10 11 damages calculations because I'm not going to get there until I 12 get past the waiver. If you want to do it all at once, you 13 can, but I'm not sure you want to where you might be getting 14 zero. 15 MS. COPPOLA: Understood, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: If you want to brief the waiver argument, that's fine, we'll set a schedule for that. It seems to 17 me -- well, I'm going to hear from Mr. Dockterman or local 18 19 counsel if you're going to speak, but it seems to me like this 10:06AM 20 is a business dispute that you should be able to resolve by 21 mediation or otherwise, but... MS. COPPOLA: Understood, your Honor, thank you. 22 23 THE COURT: Whatever I do, this is going back up on 24 appeal, and, right, and then we can start this all over again,

and the First Circuit did not feel particularly speedy on this.

MS. COPPOLA: I understand, your Honor, but I would just again remind the Court that you can order that Liberty was entitled to indemnification of its fees, and so really here that is -- indemnification truly, your Honor, it's a liquidated category of fees. It's set forth in that contract.

THE COURT: Okay.

10:07AM 20

10:07AM 10

MS. COPPOLA: And really what we're fighting about is the dollar amount.

THE COURT: Okay. I will go back and look at that.

MS. COPPOLA: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: But what I will say, and, again, I'm going to hear from you on this, but what I will say is that you should have indemnified them, so you're bad, and they should have preserved their rights better, so they're bad. So why don't you split it down the middle and call it a wrap.

What you're going to be spending on the appeal, what's the interest that's accruing on the thing, I mean this seems ridiculous to me.

MR. DOCKTERMAN: Your Honor, we could not agree more. I don't mean to breach any of the rules that we agreed to follow when we were in front of Judge King in the First Circuit, who is the mediating judge in the First Circuit, but I will say to you we tried, and I had several conversations with Judge King after the mediation failed, and we asked for further inquiries, you know, is there any interest on Liberty's

side?

10:09AM 20

10:08AM 10

We never got a moment's interest from them other than 100 percent, we want 100 percent, and that number keeps going up. I shouldn't say anymore than that.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DOCKTERMAN: But you're right, okay, but we didn't do that, we couldn't get that done.

THE COURT: I wish I heard that a little more, I never hear that, "you're right."

MR. DOCKTERMAN: On many, many things, your Honor, we are in complete agreement. The thing that's unsettled is the thing that my friends raise, which is did you say,

And you're entitled to damages? And if you go back and look at your ruling, you didn't, you said you're entitled to indemnity. They didn't file a Rule 59 motion to reopen the judgment so that they could submit damages, and they didn't file a Rule 60 motion that would give them any opportunity to do that, and when I noticed the appeal; they didn't cross-appeal saying you made an error but not giving them damages, so the three opportunities that they had to seek this, they call it waived, they just missed the deadline, and there is no procedural mechanism under the federal rules to allow them to do that now.

Rule 6 makes it very clear that the Court doesn't have the authority to extend those dates, and I'm happy to brief that. That's why we submitted the paper that we did. We don't

object to the reopening of the case, we object to the setting of the damages hearing, and I think the Court understands that.

It's ironic, if I were a Liberty Mutual policyholder and I tried to submit a late claim, what do you think Liberty Mutual would say to me, and yet when we pointed out to them and we've been pointing out to them for years, you didn't follow the rules, they say oh, we can ask for damages any time we want to, so I would like to finish the briefing on that and come back and argue that in front of you, your Honor, if you'd like to hear it. That all needs to be done before we ever get to the issue of how much the damages are.

THE COURT: Right, we agree. I don't want them to spend too much time. You don't need to respond to the amount until we rule on the issue of whether any -- but I'm just going to say again, this is a zero sum game. You're going to get it all or you're going to get none of it. You're going to be on the hook for all of it or none of it, and we're likely looking at a significantly more delay, assuming that someone is going to appeal whatever I do here, so this seems ripe for resolution among the parties, right?

So, you know, you can be a little generous and they can be a little more flexible, but how long do you want to brief it? It will be your opening brief, right?

MS. COPPOLA: Yes, your Honor, thank you. Two weeks.

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not in any big hurry.

10:10AM 20

1.3

10:12AM 20

10:11AM 10

MS. COPPOLA: Then, your Honor, considering we're up against the holidays, would it be okay with your Honor if we confirm with opposing counsel just to make sure it works with everyone's holiday schedule, submit a joint stip?

THE COURT: Correct.

MS. COPPOLA: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Obviously, the body is in the morgue, we don't have to be in any rush, all right?

MR. DOCKTERMAN: Your Honor, one thing I would say to you is when the First Circuit sent it back down, and obviously they loved this case as much as you do, and they took a long time dealing with it, they describe this as a paradigmatic District Court case. I don't know what the First Circuit ends up doing, you're probably right, whatever happens if we ask you to go all the way, one or the other of us will go, but having already been told this sits in your lap, any other issues that the Court would like us to address, happy to do so.

THE COURT: Well, the First Circuit loves to say things paradigmatic on a District Court case, it just means they're punting, and they want to see what we're going to do and then they'll criticize it again. They in my view, they could have cut this all short by ruling on the issue of damages, not the amount.

That is the paradigmatic District Court issue is what the amount of damages would be, I think, but whether or not

you're entitled to them at this point, they should have -- I 1 don't know why they didn't either send it back to begin with or 2 3 rule on it. 4 MR. DOCKTERMAN: We're all stuck with it, so we'll 5 talk about a briefing schedule and submit it to your Honor, and 6 we'll get the papers in front of you and come back at a 7 convenient time. 8 THE COURT: All right. You should figure out if there's some path to an equally unsatisfactory resolution 9 10:12AM 10 before you spend all the time briefing it, so just saying. 11 Just a thought. 12 We're always open to that. 13 THE COURT: Thanks, everyone. 14 MS. COPPOLA: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: You can either submit a schedule or you 16 can just file the thing when you're ready and they'll respond. 17 MS. COPPOLA: Understood. 18 THE COURT: Either way is fine. 19 MR. DOCKTERMAN: Thank you very much, your Honor. 20 (Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 10:12 a.m.) 21 22 23 24 25